

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 3 and 4 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) for allegedly not further limiting the subject matter of previous claim 1. Applicant traverses the objection with respect to claim 4, because claim 4 recites that the reducing step is performed “while the first step is performed,” which further limits claim 1. Nevertheless, in order to render moot the objection to both claims 3 and 4, Applicant has amended claim 1 to delete the “before the second step is performed” language therefrom. This language appears in claim 3, so that claim 3 further limits claim 1, and an unnecessary limitation is deleted from claim 1.

The Examiner rejected claims 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for reciting a “low content of impurities. Applicant traverses this rejection because the specification provides ample guidance on the meaning of this claim terminology. Nevertheless, in order to render moot this rejection, and again delete an unnecessary limitation from the claims, and move this case forward, Applicant has amended claims 17 and 20 to delete recitation of a “low content of impurities.”

Applicant traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-22 over U.S. Patent 5,716,437 to Denton, and the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-22 over U.S. Patent 6,254,736 to Sompalli.

As recited in the claims, *e.g.*, amended claim 1, in combination with the other recited steps, a reducing step includes at least one of a crushing step and a disintegrating step. As re cited, *e.g.*, in claim 20, a hot pressing step, and a crushing step are included. The Examiner cites col. 7, lines 21-67 and col. 8, lines 1-2 of Sompalli as disclosing a “crushing step.” However, these portions of Sompalli disclose “hot pressing,” not “crushing” or “disintegrating.” Hot pressing lacks adequate pressure

to crush or disintegrate impurities in the carrier or the carrier-supported-catalyst. Moreover, Sompalli's hot pressing step is more analogous to the hot pressing step recited in claim 20, which is recited in combination with a crushing step. Sompalli neither discloses nor suggests a crushing step, as recited in claim 1, or a combination of a hot pressing step and a crushing step, as recited in claim 20. The Examiner cited no crushing step in Denton because no crushing step is disclosed in Denton.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 17, 2007

By: 
James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871